

## **R E M A R K S**

### **Formal Matters**

Claims 2, 3, 5, 9, and 13-35 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claim 2 is amended herein to correct minor clerical errors.

### **Rejection of Claim Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

The Examiner states that the limitation “the retained information” has insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant herein amends claim 2 to recite “when retained information is modified” so that no antecedent basis is required. Accordingly, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Deo et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,024,450 (hereinafter “Deo”). This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Deo discloses a communications system comprising a service administrator that controls the distribution of managed objects among service processing nodes (column 4, lines 10-15). Deo further discloses that the service administrator controls the distribution of managed objects among service processing nodes (column 4, lines 10-12). Each service processing node includes at least one service processor (column 6, lines 53-54), and the service processor is the “brain” of the service processing node and is preferably a general purpose computer (column 7, lines 17-18).

By contrast, applicant's invention is a system for managing multimedia contents stored in storage mediums mounted in network connection apparatuses (specification, page 1, lines 4-6). The invention can retrieve a location and an availability of contents and data in a network, especially in a home network (page 3, lines 4-10).

It has been held by the courts that "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984). For at least the following reasons, the claimed invention is not anticipated by the cited reference. By way of example, independent claim 17 recites *each apparatus comprises a contents file and a contents monitoring unit that outputs contents modification information when the apparatus modified the contents file*. Deo does not disclose or suggest a contents monitoring unit that outputs contents modification information when the contents file of the apparatus is modified. Therefore, Deo does not disclose or suggest all of the recitations of independent claim 17. Claims 2, 3, 5, 14-16, and 18-20 depend from independent claim 17, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features of the base claim. Accordingly, claims 2, 3, 5, 14-16 and 18-20 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Thus, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection of Claim 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Doi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,970,919 (hereinafter "Doi"). This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Doi discloses a network management method and system which allow control and settings to be easily made with respect to each of different services by providing a physical network structure and a logical network structure on a service-wide basis (column 2, lines 22-26). Doi further discloses a database which stores network configuration information and view configuration information (column 2, lines 56-57) wherein information about network elements is collected (column 5, lines 21-23). However, Doi does not disclose or suggest an apparatus that comprises a contents file and a contents monitoring unit that outputs contents modification information when the apparatus modifies the contents file, as recited in claim 17. Therefore, Doi does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention as required for a finding of anticipation. Accordingly, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 13 and 21-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Deo in view of admitted prior art (hereinafter “AAPA”). This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

It has been held by the courts that to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See, *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). As illustrated above, Deo does not teach or suggest all features of independent claim 17. The addition of AAPA does not overcome this deficiency. The AAPA cited by the Examiner consists of Official Notice taken that database administration in a computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made. This AAPA does not include the limitation recited in independent claim 17 that *each apparatus comprises a contents file and a contents*

*monitoring unit that outputs contents modification information when the apparatus modified the contents file.* Thus, the hypothetical combination of Deo and AAPA does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 17.

Claims 13 and 21-35 depend from independent claim 17, and thus incorporate novel and nonobvious features of the base claim. Accordingly, claims 13, and 21-35 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Thus applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim 9**

Applicant appreciates that the Examiner has not rejected claim 9 and thus finds claim 9 allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra  
Registration No. 47,155

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343 (telephone); (516) 742-4366 (facsimile)  
KRV:kd